

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_126366
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of stemphylium blight disease caused by Stemphylium vesicarium in onion through different methodology
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Management of stemphylium blight disease caused by <i>Stemphylium vesicarium</i> in onion through different methodology is helpful to scientific community.	Yes, It is helpful for the scientific and farming community both.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Management of stemphylium blight disease caused by <i>Stemphylium vesicarium</i> in onion through different methodology" If possible change title	Not Possible to change the title
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	1.The abstract should be concise and informative. 2.It should be within 300 words in length. 3.It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods (Missing) used, major findings with important data and conclusions.	Abstract is concised
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate not proper way (Violating authors guidelines)	It is as per the guidelines
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because projection of investigation in different way	Yes it is scientifically correct.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Numbering missing (Follow authors guidelines) Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa Kindly remove predatory journals	Revisions done
Minor REVISION comments		-
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NA	
Optional/General comments		-

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	-